

REVEALING THE FACES OF RURAL POVERTY IN INDONESIA: A CASE FROM TEMANGGUNG, CENTRAL JAVA

Rofah Rofah

UIN Sunan Kalijaga
Email: rofah@uin-suka.ac.id

Astri Hanjarwati

UIN Sunan Kalijaga
Email: astri.hanjarwati@uin-suka.ac.id

Jamil Suprihatiningrum

UIN Sunan Kalijaga
Email: jamil.suprihatiningrum@uin-suka.ac.id

Abstract

Previous research on poverty in rural areas of Indonesia has identified structural poverty as a significant underlying cause. This article aims to provide an overview of the internal and external factors contributing to poverty in rural Java. The study utilized quantitative research methods and was conducted in the Merah Village, Temanggung, Central Java, which was selected as a representative area falling within the national poverty threshold. The findings indicated that rural communities were confronted not only with structural poverty issues such as limited access to economic resources, education, and empowerment. In addition, cultural poverty further compounded the issue, as it was characterized by pervasive perceptions of subjective well-being among the rural communities, with a majority (81.7%) feeling poor and uncertain about finding a way out of their situation, while only a minority (18.3%) felt prosperous. The prevalent perception of cultural poverty is closely intertwined with the structural characteristics of Javanese society, particularly the concept of 'nerimo', which can be interpreted as the belief that poverty is a God-given destiny that cannot be rejected or altered.

Keywords: Rural poverty; Cultural poverty; Structural poverty

Abstrak

Berbagai studi terdahulu tentang kemiskinan pedesaan di Indonesia telah mengungkapkan kemiskinan struktural telah menjadi penyebab utama. Artikel ini bermaksud untuk mendeskripsikan penyebab internal dan eksternal kemiskinan di pedesaan Jawa. Penelitian dilakukan dengan menggunakan metode kuantitatif, dengan mengambil lokasi di Desa Merah, Temanggung, Jawa Tengah sebagai representasi dari wilayah yang masih berada dalam garis kemiskinan nasional. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa masyarakat pedesaan tidak hanya dihadapkan pada problem kemiskinan struktural seperti misalnya minimnya akses ke sumber-sumber ekonomi, pendidikan, dan pemberdayaan. Namun juga semakin diperparah dengan kemiskinan kultural yang ditandai dengan kuatnya persepsi terhadap kesejahteraan subyektif, seperti misalnya perasaan bahwa mereka adalah orang miskin dan kebingungan bagaimana mencari jalan keluar atas situasi tersebut (81,7%), selebihnya hanya 18,3% yang merasa sejahtera. Kuatnya persepsi kemiskinan kultural ini berkaitan erat dengan karakter struktur masyarakat Jawa yang 'nerimo', yang dapat diartikan sebagai keyakinan bahwa kemiskinan mereka adalah takdir tuhan yang tidak bisa ditolak..

Kata kunci: Kemiskinan pedesaan; Kemiskinan kultural; Kemiskinan struktural

A. INTRODUCTION

Poverty in countries all over the world, including Indonesia, is concentrated in rural areas or regions with limited resources. The problem of poverty is linked to various other factors such as job opportunities, levels of education, health, political engagement, infrastructure, and the natural surroundings. Groups that are considered minorities, such as women, elderly individuals, and people with disabilities, frequently experience poverty as a challenge.

The characteristics of poverty are closely linked to the measurement of the fulfillment of basic human needs, biologically, socially, and psychologically. The degree of poverty is linked to an individual's ability to meet some basic needs. The easier or more capable a person or group of people are in acquiring and meeting basic needs, the further they fall into the category of the poor and vice versa.

Poverty which is a multidimensional problem can be seen from various perspectives. The dimensions of poverty encompass four primary factors: lack of opportunities, low capabilities, low level of security, and low capacity or empowerment. Poverty is linked to restricted social, economic, and political rights, which can lead to vulnerability, degradation, and a sense of powerlessness.

It is important to stress that poverty differs from income distribution inequality. Poverty is strongly connected to the fulfillment of basic needs, whereas inequality pertains to the comparative level of prosperity within society. The definition of basic needs in the context of poverty extends beyond purely economic needs, which involve satisfying consumptive requirements like food, clothing, and shelter. It also encompasses the ability to contribute, participate, and function effectively in society, particularly in terms of development.

According to Statistics Indonesia (2022) data, there has been a downward trend in Indonesia's poverty rate in both numerical and percentage terms between March 2010 and March 2021. On the other hand, there was an increase in poverty between March 2020 and September 2020, even though there was a slight decrease in March 2021. Over the period of March 2021, the proportion of people living in poverty in urban areas relative to rural areas was 12.18 million (7.89%) and 15.37 million (13.10%). The depth of rural poverty in March 2021 was 2.27, compared with 2.21 in March 2020. At the same time, the poverty severity index in rural areas over the same period also decreased from 0.55 to 0.057. With regards to the Farmer Exchange Rate (NTP) data, there was a rise in the index from 103.09 to 103.29 between March 2020 and March 2021. However, when examining the monthly data over the course of a year, some months showed a decline (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2021).

In the same way, with the data on poverty at Temanggung Regency, the latest data are presented from the update of the integrated database (PBDT) in 2015. PBDT (Poverty Data Updating Team) utilizes a decile-based approach to update the data on Poor Households (RTMs) according to their welfare level. There are four deciles in total, with decile 1 being the group with the lowest welfare level of up to 10%, decile 2 consisting of those with a welfare level of 11-20%, decile 3 including households with a welfare level of 21-30%, and decile 4 encompassing those with a welfare level of 31-40%. According to the PBDT data in 2015, Decile 1 was composed of 289 villages that were categorized into four groups: Red, Yellow, Green, and Blue Villages. The number of poor people in red villages

was 15,749, Yellow was 5,578, Green was 4,548, and Blue was 3,855. Based on this data, it can be inferred that 28.72% of the villages in Temanggung Regency are categorized as red villages, with an estimated 52.97% of the total population living in these villages.

The data indicate that red villages have a high number of RTMs, highlighting the issue of poverty as a primary challenge that needs to be addressed in the development process. Efforts to address poverty should start at the smallest level (the household), and extend to the village, regional, and national levels. Understanding the concept of poverty and the indicators used to measure poverty is essential to developing a poverty reduction strategy. Poverty indicators are used as a basis to determine target groups (targeting), tracking progress, and performance indicators.

According to Nazaruddin et al. (2017), poverty is when individuals or households lack access to basic necessities such as food, clothing, shelter, and clean drinking water, ultimately affecting their quality of life. According to Frankenhuis & Nettle (2020), poor people are people who have difficulty meeting basic needs, do not have much control over their environment, and have a higher potential for violence. United Nations (2020) stated that poverty refers to more than just the absence of income and other means of supporting a sustainable way of life. It also encompasses other types of deprivation, such as hunger, malnutrition, limited access to education and essential services, social exclusion and marginalization, and less participation in the decision-making process.

Statistics Indonesia (2021) uses the concept of the basic needs approach (ability to meet basic needs) in measuring poverty. With this approach, poverty is seen as an inability in the economic aspect to meet the basic needs of food and non-food measured from the

outcome. Alkire et al. (2020) approached poverty by examining three distinct aspects: health, which includes malnutrition and child mortality; education, which encompasses the length of schooling and attendance; and living standards, which involve access to sanitation, electricity, housing, assets, and clean drinking water.

According to Santoso (2018), poverty is not permanent and continually shifts upward toward improvement or worse. Atkinson (2019) stated that from a political perspective, poverty can be defined in two ways from a political perspective as per the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, where the poverty line denotes a situation where individuals or families earn an income below the government's definition standard. Secondly, poverty can be defined subjectively, as per the *Oxford English Dictionary*, where the poverty line refers to an estimated minimum income required to fulfill basic life necessities.

Deonand (2019) categorizes poverty into two types: absolute and relative. Absolute poverty refers to a state where individuals or households are unable to meet the bare minimum necessities for basic living standards. Relative poverty is a condition of capability under the calculated threshold of a desired population. According to one definition of relative poverty, an individual is considered poor if their income is below 60% of the population's average income.

Based on the definition of poverty, it can be inferred that poverty is a complex issue that encompasses multiple dimensions of life. Poverty is also related to inequality. Inequality in distribution such as income or consumption. Therefore, it is expected that understanding the definition of poverty, the condition known as

poverty, the context of poverty, identification of the causes of poverty, and prior research on poverty prevention will enable the creation of comprehensive policy formulation in efforts to prevent poverty.

B. METHODOLOGY

Quantitative research involves gathering data in the form of numbers, processing those numbers, and then analyzing them to uncover the scientific information behind those numbers. This kind of research is a survey study, where the researchers select a sample of respondents and provide them with a standard questionnaire. The following are poverty indicators in the red villages of Temanggung Regency compiled in the questionnaire.

1. Basic Data of the Households
2. Subjective well-being
3. Core well-being
4. Supporting Environment (Context)
5. Infrastructure and Services Education, Health and Public Services

According to the 2015 PBDT, Temanggung was divided into four village divisions from 20 sub-districts: red villages (83), yellow villages (51), green villages (65), and blue villages (90). This study focuses on red villages, so the population used is 83 red villages spread over 20 sub-districts of Temanggung Regency. The sampling method employed is proportional simple random sampling, in which 5 respondents with similar characteristics are randomly chosen from each village, making a total selection of 415 respondents.

In this study, there are 4 research objectives, data types, and data analysis methods, namely:

Table 1.
Analytical Methods

Purpose of research	Types of data and analytical methods
1. Analyzing the data of Poor Families in red villages in Temanggung Regency;	Using quantitative descriptive analytic methods and cross-tabular analysis, the questionnaire results were filled out and analyzed using SPSS version 26.0.
2. Identification of Poor Families' problems in red villages;	The questionnaire filling data were analyzed using quantitative descriptors.

Source: Researchers, 2020.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Causes of Poverty

According to McKendric et al. (2021), four main categories of factors contribute to poverty: personal behavioral issues, social factors, economic factors, and political factors. Individual behavioral factors are the view that poverty is an outcome of deviated personality. However, this view is criticized because individual factors only reflect the actual hidden factors, namely social and economic factors.

Social traits are those that classify people into groups, impact their daily lives with additional demands, or increase their vulnerability to other variables that contribute to poverty. According to Bank et al. (2017), there is substantial data demonstrating a connection between poverty and disability. Political issues affect the government's willingness to step in and implement initiatives to combat poverty as well as the effectiveness of those programs. The

explanation of economic factors depends, among other things, on the macro and local economies. The stronger a country's economy, the lower the intensity and the lower the poverty rate. A baseline for looking at economic growth is to use GDP (Gross Domestic Product).

Davidai (2022) explained that economic conditions, whether rich or poor, can be influenced both internally and externally. Certain groups of people believe that an individual's poverty results from a flawed personality characterized by a lack of skills or abilities, laziness, and lack of motivation. Conversely, these groups tend to associate wealth with superior personality traits, such as high competence and a strong work ethic. On the other hand, some people stress that poverty is shaped by factors that are outside of an individual's control, such as the absence of job opportunities, insufficient social services, and an unsupportive environment. This could include low salaries that lead to decreased motivation.

Arifin (2020) has put the roots of poverty in two, structural and cultural. Structural poverty is caused by existing social structures in society. These circumstances impact individuals' ability to acquire economic resources. For instance, farmers with limited agricultural land may work diligently, but their efforts may not produce adequate outcomes. The concept of cultural poverty is linked to an individual's personality, mental and behavioral patterns, and attitudes that arise from the state of mind that is unable to adapt to the constantly evolving and dynamic nature of life. Brady (2019), in the analysis of poverty theories, categorized the causes of poverty into three distinct groups: individual traits/behavior, structural factors, and political reasons.

Asrol and Ahmad (2018) conducted research on poverty in Indonesia which revealed that measures such as promoting economic growth (measured by GDP), investing in education (as

indicated by the duration of education), improving health outcomes (as reflected by life expectancy), and increasing government expenditure on infrastructure development can contribute to a reduction in the poverty rate. On the other hand, Afandi et al. (2017) argued that economic growth does not contribute to poverty reduction in Indonesia. When it comes to inflation, the escalation of prices leads to an increase in poverty levels. Conversely, Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) has been observed to have a positive correlation with reducing poverty rates. The Gini ratio was deemed unrelated to poverty.

Adhi et al. (2016) colleagues discovered that cultural values were significant contributors to the challenges faced in poverty alleviation efforts. Precisely, the practice of begging, a tendency towards laziness, pessimism, giving up easily, lacking motivation, and accepting one's fate were identified as factors that impede progress in poverty reduction. Economic factors are limited to clothing, nutrition, and housing. Social factors are low levels of education, health, and social environment. Then the political factors are gender differences, limited access, and limited contributions from investors and the wealthy to the poor.

Poverty cannot be simply defined as the inability to fulfill basic needs. It is a complex phenomenon that is impacted by various factors, and these variables interact with each other in intricate ways to create what is known as a poverty cycle or poverty trap. Individuals or households with limited income and live in areas with high crime rates are more likely to experience physical harm or loss of work time and other resources. This highlights how people with

scarce resources can become further disadvantaged due to the negative impact of their environment on their abilities, resources, and assets (Morris, Santos, and Neumeyer 2018).

2. Poverty Indicators

Indicators of poverty refer to the variables utilized to measure or identify individuals classified as part of the poor group. Differences in poverty methods and indicators have an impact on different poverty identification results, so clear and appropriate measurements are needed (Drago 2021). In the United States, two methods are used to measure poverty, including the official and supplemental poverty measures. Both of these measurements identify the population that falls under the poor category.

The Official Poverty Measure refers to a method of measuring poverty by comparing pre-tax income against the poverty threshold. This threshold is determined by multiplying the minimum cost of food by three, and it varies based on the size, composition, and age of the head of the family. *The Supplemental Poverty Measure* utilizes thresholds that take into account expenditures on food, clothing, shelter, and utilities. These thresholds vary depending on the family's size, composition, and geographic location, and they adjust for housing costs, which are then compared to household income to determine poverty status (Institute for Research on Poverty University of Wisconsin-Madison 2018).

In Indonesia, poverty measurement uses provisions from Statistics Indonesia in the form of a poverty line. The Poverty Line (GK) represents the amount of money in rupiah that is needed for an individual to cover their basic needs, including food and non-food expenses, for a month. The Non-Food Poverty Line (GKNM) refers to the minimum amount of money required to cover non-food

expenses, such as housing, clothing, education, and health. The bundle of non-food essential items consists of 51 types of goods in urban areas and 47 types of goods in rural areas (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2021). Apart from the poverty line, there are other ways to gauge poverty, such as the poverty gap (P1), which measures the extent of poverty, and poverty severity (P2), which measures the intensity of poverty. The higher the value of the index, the higher the disparity in spending among the poor (Nugroho et al. 2020).

UNDP and Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative developed the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) which complements the previous poverty indicator of \$1.25 per day (Dotter and Klasen 2017). *The Multidimensional Poverty Index* measures poverty by utilizing 10 indicators, each with its different score weight. Four indicators in the measurement of poverty carry a weight of 1/6 each: nutrition, child mortality, duration of schooling, and attendance in school. The remaining six indicators that are taken into consideration when measuring poverty include cooking fuel, sanitation, drinking water (or access to drinking water that takes 30 minutes or less to reach), electricity (or lack thereof), and housing quality (including inadequate roofing, walls, and flooring). These indicators carry a weight of $1/18$ each. If individual scores $1/3$ or more of the total value for all indicators, they are deemed one $1/2$ or more of the total value for all the indicators, they are categorized as being severely poor. However, if their score falls within the range of 20-33%, it means that they are at risk of falling into poverty (Alkire and Jahan 2018).

3. Poverty Conditions in Temanggung Regency

The 2015 PBDT shows that the RTM with the lowest welfare level (less than 10%) was 29,730 people, with the highest number in the red villages being 15,749 people with the division of the population can be seen in Table 1. Out of the 20 districts in Temanggung Regency, Bulu District has the highest poverty rate of 5.25%. On the other hand, Pringsurat District has the lowest poverty rate, with only 1.42% of its population considered poor. Various entities such as governments, non-governmental organizations, and communities have undertaken initiatives to alleviate poverty. These efforts include charitable programs such as social assistance and reduction-oriented strategies like providing access to capital for borrowing. Programs or policies are relatively consistent in these regions, unlike the multi-dimensional nature of poverty.

Table 2.
Decile data of 1 population in Red, Yellow, Green, and Blue Villages

Category Village	Total Village/Sub-district	Total People
Red Village	83	15749
Yellow Village	51	5578
Green Village	65	4548
Blue Village	90	3855
Total	289	29730

Source: Researcher data processing results (2022).

4. Respondents Description

The respondents were chosen as representatives of the Poor Household (RTM) group in the red villages of Temanggung Regency. The survey consisted of a total of 415 individuals, each representing one Poor Household. In the red villages of Temanggung Regency,

most of the Poor Households are comprised of three or four members, with both groups having an equal percentage of 27.2%.

In the red villages of Temanggung Regency, the Poor Households are predominantly Javanese, accounting for 99.8% of the households surveyed. Only 0.2% of the households belonged to the Sundanese. 24.8% of poor households have more than one family member who is orphaned, widowed, or with a disability. The characteristics of respondents can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3.
Characteristics of Respondents

		Respondents (n=415)	
		N	%
Amount of family members.	1 person	17	4.1
	2 people	61	14.7
	3 people	113	27.2
	4 people	113	27.2
	5 people	63	15.2
	6 people	29	7
	7 people	19	4.6
Ethnicity	Javanese	414	99.8
	Sudanese	1	0.2
Orphan, widow or with disability.	1 person	55	13.3
	>1 person	48	11.6
	None	312	75.2

Source: Researcher data processing results (2022)

5. Development of Poverty and Economic Growth

a. Subjective well-being

The measure of subjective well-being in this study was based on how the respondents perceived their own state of well-being, level of poverty, and happiness. The survey results on the respondents' perception of feeling prosperous revealed that 64.6% of them felt

uncertain, 17.1% felt unwell, and only 18.3% of the respondents reported feeling prosperous. Regarding the perception of poverty, a majority of the respondents, up to 81.7%, reported feeling poor. A portion of the respondents, 16.4%, reported feeling somewhat poor, while 1.9% of the respondents reported not feeling poor. In terms of the perception of feelings of happiness, the majority of the respondents, 79.8%, reported feeling unhappy, while 18.3% of the respondents felt uncertain about their level of happiness. Only 1.9% of respondents felt happy.

b. Core Wellbeing

The core well-being of the respondents was determined based on their evaluation of access to health services, unmet primary needs, and access to clean drinking water. Regarding the ability to obtain healthcare services, most of the survey participants, accounting for 89.6%, reported having no trouble accessing these services. Conversely, only 1% of the respondents reported complete difficulty and inability to access healthcare, while 9.4% of them found it challenging but still managed to access these services. Then for the fulfillment of primary needs, the majority of low-income households in red villages have not met their primary needs.

Out of the 415 respondents, a significant majority of 83.1% indicated that their basic needs had not been fulfilled. Only 2.7% of the respondents reported their primary needs being met. The remaining 14.2% hesitated about whether their primary needs had been met. Access to clean drinking water in the red villages is good. Approximately 80.5% of poor households have access to clean drinking water, while 18.3% of households can only access clean drinking water occasionally. A small proportion of 1.2% reported

being unable to access clean drinking water. For more details, the data can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4.
RTM Core Wellbeing Characteristics

		Respondents (n=415)	
		N	%
Access to health services	It is very difficult and inaccessible	4	1
	It's hard, but sometimes accessible.	39	9.4
	Easy	372	89.6
Unfulfilled basic needs	Yes	345	83.1
	Maybe	59	14.2
	No	11	2.7
Access to clean drinking water	Yes, always accessible	334	80.5
	Yes, but not always (on occasion)	76	18.3
	No	5	1.2

Source: Researcher data processing results (2022)

c. Material Wealth

The household respondents from poor households in red village were categorized into three criteria, namely below average, average, and above average standards, based on observations made by enumerators. The respondents who own a house were categorized as follows: 61% were below average, 38.3% were of average standard, and 0.7% were above average. Furthermore, material wealth is also measured from motorcycle ownership. According to the surveys conducted among all respondents, 51.6% did not own a motorcycle. Out of the households surveyed, 12.3% owned a motorcycle but it was damaged, while 35.9% had a

motorcycle that was in good condition and fully functional. It can be concluded that most of the poor households use motorcycle as a mode of daily transportation.

d. *Economy*

The income sources for RTMs are primarily from services such as artisans, workshops, farm laborers, and domestic assistants, accounting for 46.3%. The agricultural/vegetable sector contributes 11% of the income, followed by 8.9% from tobacco farming, 4.8% from livestock, and 16.1% from other sectors. In terms of income stability among the 415 RTMs in red villages, the largest proportion, at 83.1%, reported having no fixed income. The second largest group of RTMs, accounting for 9.6%, reported having a partially fixed and partially non-fixed income. A smaller percentage of RTMs, specifically at least 7.2%, reported having a fixed income. A significant majority of poor households in red villages who participated in the survey, accounting for 60.7% or 252 RTMs, reported having a monthly income between 0 and 500.000. The RTMs' second largest income category is between 500.000-1,000,000, which accounts for 37.1% or 154 RTMs. The third largest income category is between 1.000.000-2.500.000, which accounts for 1.7% or 7 RTMs.

Additional indicators of the economic characteristics of poor households include income stability, average monthly income, ability to purchase rice, and access to credit. The survey results regarding these indicators can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5.
Economic Characteristics of RTMs

		Respondents (n=415)	
		N	%
Sources of Income	Family Support	19	4.6
	Trade	12	2.9
	Private Employee	6	1.4
	Services (handyman, mechanic, farmhand, housekeeper, shop assistant)	187	45.1
	Kiosk/stall/shop	2	0.5
	Village Administrator Salary	1	0.2
	Rubber	2	0.5
	Coffee	7	1.7
	Tobacco	37	8.9
	Other Forest Products	5	1.2
	Handicrafts	4	1
	Agriculture (vegetables)	46	11.1
	Livestock (cattle, goats, chickens, ducks, fish)	20	4.8
	Others	67	16.1
Income stability	Not-fixed	345	83.1
	Partially fixed	40	9.6
	Yes fixed	30	7.2
Average monthly income	0-500.000	252	60.7
	>500.000-1.000.000	154	37.1
	>1.000.000-2.500.000	7	1.7
	>5.000.000	2	0.5
Opportunity to purchase rice.	Sometimes unable to afford rice	105	25.3
	We always buy rice	234	56.4
	We can always purchase rice without worries.	63	15.2
	We have enough supplies until the next harvest	13	3.1
Access to credit	Cannot get credit, too difficult	72	17.3
	It is difficult but capable to get it.	66	15.9
	Can be obtained and easy	34	8.2
	Never asked because I wasn't interested	243	58.6

Source: Researcher data processing results (2022)

e. Social

The survey results showed that the majority of people in red villages considered that the level of help was at a moderate level. Out of all the respondents, 298 individuals (71.8%) rated the level of help as moderate, while 83 individuals (20%) rated it as high. Only 34 respondents (8.2%) believed that the level of help in their village was still low. According to the survey, most people in red villages (65.1%) perceived the level of mutual trust between neighbors to be moderate. A significant proportion of respondents (32.5%) considered the level of mutual trust to be high, while only a small percentage (2.4%) believed it to be low. Disputes between neighbors of the red villages are rare. These findings are based on a survey of 415 respondents, in which the majority (76.4%) reported that conflicts rarely occur between neighbors. A smaller percentage of respondents (19.3%) claimed that conflicts never occur, while only 4.3% reported that they often have conflicts with their neighbors.

The Javanese people in the red villages of Temanggung Regency are classified as "The Abangan" based on Javanese typology. The Abangan community who still practice the Javanese religion often hold "*selamatan*" in every significant moment of their lives (Amrozi 2021). The majority of people in the conservative society category (Nahdlatul Ulama) exhibit traits such as submission to God's will and a high degree of flexibility towards the ancestral cultural traditions and celebrations that are passed down to them (Effendi 2020).

f. Development Participation

Accessibility of community information in red villages is classified as accessible. Based on a survey of 415 RTMs, 80.5% of respondents responded that they could access information. A small

percentage of people (4.3%) have access to information from multiple sources, while a more significant proportion (15.2%) do not have access to information. Similarly, with regard to participation in development planning meetings, the majority of respondents (87.5%) were not invited and did not attend these meetings. Only a small percentage of the public (12.6%) were invited and participated in development planning meetings.

g. The Facility of Public Service

In this case, the availability of educational facilities at the primary level is evaluated based on the proximity of the nearest junior high school to the village where the poor household family resides. According to the survey results, a majority of respondents (81.7%) reported easy access to the nearest junior high school. A smaller percentage of respondents (17.8%) found it challenging to access the school but were still able to do so, while a very small percentage (0.5%) found it extremely difficult and were unable to attend the nearest junior high school. Based on the survey of 415 respondents, the majority (61.4%) believed that the quality of education in schools was good. The second highest percentage of respondents (23.6%) believed that the quality of education in schools was average or ordinary. A small percentage of respondents (13.7%) stated that they did not have enough knowledge to assess the quality of education around them. Another small percentage (1.2%) believed that the quality of education in schools was poor. The distribution of scholarships for school-age children from poor families in red villages has not been equitable. Based on the survey of 415

respondents, a large majority (69.4%) of school-age children from poor households did not receive scholarships. Out of 21.4% of respondents surveyed it is reported that their school-age children received scholarships, while 9.5% did not have school-age children.

The public perception of non-governmental programs/support in red villages is as follows: 11.8% of the respondents believe that the quality and quantity of these programs/support are good, 21.2% believe that they are good only in terms of quality, 56.1% of respondents do not know about non-government programs and support, and 10.8% believe that the quality and quantity of these programs/support are low. According to the results of a survey on the availability of special services for vulnerable people, 77.6% of the respondents answered that they were not aware of any special services or facilities available for vulnerable people. Furthermore, 18.3% of respondents answered hesitantly, indicating a lack of knowledge, and only 4.4% of respondents stated that there were facilities/services available for vulnerable communities.

According to the survey, 65.5% of the respondents believed that the government was responsive to community problems, whereas 11.8% of the respondents expressed their uncertainty regarding the government's response to community complaints. Additionally, 22.4% of the respondents were not aware of the government's response to community problems.

6. Internal Factors Causing Poverty

The low level of education of household members. Approximately 80% of residents in red villages have completed only elementary school or an equivalent level of education. The lack of higher education among the majority of RTMs in red villages presents challenges in securing decent employment opportunities,

as their education level may not qualify them as experts in their fields. Due to their limited education, RTMs in red villages are often restricted to low-skilled jobs, such as being maids or farm laborers.

The lack of expertise of household members other than in the field of agriculture. Most RTMs have no special skills other than in agriculture. They are rarely involved in training - both hard skills and soft skills. The low capacity of RTMs is influential in the difficulty of opening a business or gaining access to a decent job.

Not having a permanent job. Many RTMs in red villages lack permanent employment, resulting in implications for their monthly income and making it challenging to meet their family's needs. Not being permanently employed is due to their low level of education and lack of expertise.

The minimum income. The income earned by RTMs (mainly in the range of less than IDR 500.000 per month) is only enough to fulfill their food necessity but it is still difficult to meet other necessities adequately for clothing, board, health, and education.

Lack of access to reliable transportation options. On the basis of a survey of motor vehicle ownership, most MTRs do not have an engine cycle for day-to-day mobility. Some of them have a motorcycle, but the state of their vehicle is unsuitable for covering certain distances, such as only being appropriate for short trips to rice fields or fields. As a result, the limited condition of their transportation makes it challenging for RTMs to access economic resources that are far away from their place of residence and may require considerable time to reach.

Unstable income/earnings of RTMs. Stability in income and earnings influences how RTMs meet their necessities. As much as 80% of RTM has an uncertain income every month. According to the survey, only 18.3% of RTMs think they are doing well. The remaining individuals may be hesitant or feel that their lives lack prosperity because they are still facing challenging circumstances in meeting their basic needs.

Feelings of Poverty, according to a survey, 81.7% of RTMs express feelings of poverty, but there seems to be a lack of desire or clarity about how to improve their current living conditions. Happy feeling. Because they are poor, they feel that their life is not happy.

7. External Factors Causing Poverty

Minimum training of hard skills and soft skills for the RTMs. The insufficient provision of both technical and non-technical skills training (such as vocational training or entrepreneurship support) for RTMs has led to a deficiency in the skills possessed by this group of people. This makes it challenging to access decent work/effort. Moreover, RTMs typically lack a stable source of income, with the exception of many farmers whose livelihoods heavily rely on weather conditions that are often unpredictable.

Difficulty in obtaining credit/capital. RTMs face several challenges in accessing credit or capital due to various reasons such as a lack of trust from lenders due to their unstable income, apprehension about applying for loans, and concerns about their ability to repay the loan. Low political participation/participation in proposed development programs. The participation of RTMs in development planning deliberations is still minimal. Merely 12.5% of RTMs participate in development planning meetings, whereas the vast majority, which accounts for 87.5%, do not partake in these

meetings. RTMs, being a target group for development, ought to be included in various development discussions and forums to allow them to suggest various programs that could empower them.

The distribution of scholarships (Kartu Indonesia Pintar) is still minimal and uneven. The distribution of scholarships for school-age children in RTMs has not been equitable. Only 21.2% of RTMs received scholarships. As a result, the uneven distribution of scholarships has resulted in poor students having limited access to higher education beyond elementary and junior high schools due to the financial burden.

Uninhabitable Houses Rehabilitation (RTLH) has not been evenly distributed. The condition of the RTMs House is mostly uninhabitable. The government has offered assistance in the form of RTLH, but due to budgetary limitations, only approximately 3.9% of RTMs (as indicated by respondents) have received this form of aid. Whereas according to data, specifically in red villages, there are still 60.2% substandard housing (RTLH). That is, more than half of RTMs live in uninhabitable houses.

8. Carrying Capacity

There is good access to health services and good quality of health services in red villages. Access to health services for RTMs is very easy and of good quality. This has become crucial for the community's capacity to uphold good health and minimize healthcare expenses. Access to clean drinking water has also been met. All red villages can access clean drinking water both through PAM and well water. This is crucial in supporting impoverished

individuals to maintain good sanitation practices and promote a clean and healthy environment.

Apart from the provision of health services and clean drinking water, the red villages' social environment demonstrates encouraging qualities such as communal support, mutual trust, and a low incidence of conflicts. A harmonious and peaceful social life becomes a supporter of community life. Experiencing feelings of safety, trust, and minimal conflict within a community can contribute to the ability to find happiness in life.

The red villages have shown a positive trend in terms of access to information and communication facilities, which are readily available. Having easy access to information and reliable communication facilities can facilitate the process of obtaining better economic opportunities. Easy access to junior high school (nearby school) and good quality education. Having easy access to junior high school education is crucial for the community to have the capacity to attain higher education and pursue decent career opportunities. Distribution of KIS, KKS, and RASTRA assistance has been widely received by RTMs. The distribution of government aid, which has been widely received by low-income households, has resulted in an improved standard of living for them. However, there is still some work to be done by local governments to ensure equity in the distribution of aid.

Infrastructure (roads, bridges, access to markets) in red villages is good and easily accessible. Having easy access to infrastructure is crucial for improving the economic conditions of low-income households, and can serve as a facilitator for economic growth. Low-income households have a positive perception of government aid that they have received. According to the survey results, the public has a strong belief and confidence in the

effectiveness of government aid. The positive perception of the public towards government assistance makes it easier for the government to provide aid and encourage community participation in various programs aimed at improving their quality of life. A responsive government that can receive public complaints. Governments that are responsive to the problems faced by the community become a good carrying capacity in fostering trust and quality of life of RTMs.

9. Relationship Between Different Factors Contributing to Poverty

The relationship between education level factors and income. According to the findings from cross-tabulation analysis (refer to Table 6), there is a notable and statistically significant correlation between the variables "level of education" and "monthly income per household (RTM)". The higher education levels tend to be associated with higher income levels. This relationship holds true for the impoverished households in red villages, where most individuals have received primary school education and earn an average monthly income of less than IDR 500.000. Education is a fundamental factor in the cause of poverty in the red villages.

Table 6.
Highest Education of Family Members * Average monthly income Crosstabulation

		Average monthly income				Total	
		0-500.00	>500.00-1.000.00	>1.000.00-2.500.00	>5.000.00		
Highest Education of Family Members	People's School (SR) or Elementary or ES equivalency or Less	Count	207	115	3	2	327
		% within Highest Education of Family Members	63.3%	35.2%	0.9%	0.6%	100%
		% within Average monthly income	82.5%	74.7%	42.9%	100%	79%
		% of Total	50%	27.8%	0.7%	0.5%	79%
	Junior high school or junior high school equivalency	Count	41	38	3	0	82
		% within Highest Education of Family Members	50%	46.3%	3.7%	0.0%	100%
		% within Average monthly income	16.3%	24.7%	42.9%	0.0%	19.8%
		% of Total	9.9%	9.2%	0.7%	0.0%	19.8%
	SHS or higher or senior high school equivalency	Count	3	1	1	0	5
		% within Highest Education of Family Members	60%	20%	20%	0.0%	100%
		% within Average monthly income	1.2%	0.6%	14.3%	0.0%	1.2%
		% of Total	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	1.2%
Total	Count	251	154	7	2	414	
	% within Highest Education of Family Members	60.6%	37.2%	1.7%	0.5%	100%	
	% within Average monthly income	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
	% of Total	60.6%	37.2%	1.7%	0.5%	100%	

Source: Researcher data processing results (2022)

The relationship between the average monthly income factor and access to loans/credit. Cross-tabulation analysis between the average monthly income and access to credit is interrelated (see 574 | *Jurnal Sosiologi Reflektif*, Vol. 17, No. 2, April 2023

Table 6). The challenge of accessing credit is attributed to the absence of a regular monthly income for individuals. This makes it difficult for people to get additional capital to increase their income. The absence of a regular monthly income leads to a lack of confidence from cooperatives, banks, or other financial institutions in extending productive business capital loans.

Table 7.
Average Monthly Income* Access to Credit / Loan
Crosstabulation

		Access to Credit / Loans				Total		
		Cannot get credit, too difficult	It is difficult, can be obtained	Can be obtained and easy	Never asked because I wasn't interested			
		Count	43	24	17	167	251	
Average monthly income	0-500.000	% within Access to Credit / Loans	59.7%	36.4%	50%	69%	60.6%	
		% of Total	10.4%	5.8%	4.1%	40.3%	60.6%	
			Count	27	39	15	73	154
	>500.000-1.000.000	% within Access to Credit / Loans	37.5%	59.1%	44.1%	30.2%	37.2%	
		% of Total	6.5%	9.4%	3.6%	17.6%	37.2%	
			Count	0	3	2	2	7
	>1.000.000-2.500.000	% within Access to Credit / Loans	0.0%	4.5%	5.9%	0.8%	1.7%	
		% of Total	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%	1.7%	
			Count	2	0	0	0	2
	>5.000.000	% within Access to Credit / Loans	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	
		% of Total	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	
			Count	72	66	34	242	414
Total	% within Access to Credit / Loans	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		

% of Total	17.4%	15.9%	8.2%	58.5%	100%
------------	-------	-------	------	-------	------

Source: Researcher data processing results (2022)

The correlation between the absence of soft-skills training in the community and limited expertise beyond agriculture. According to the findings from the cross-tabulation analysis, there is a discernible association between the deficiency in hard and soft skills training in the community and the limited proficiency in fields beyond agriculture. Therefore, the government and the community need to conduct hard and soft skills training to increase the capacity of RTMs. As the expertise of the community in red villages improves through enhanced skills, it has the potential to positively impact the overall quality of life for the households in red villages (RTMs).

D. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The poverty that occurs in the red villages of Temanggung Regency is caused by internal and external factors. RTMs poverty can be influenced by internal factors such as household members' level of education being low, their lack of expertise in non-agricultural fields, the absence of regular employment opportunities, insufficient income, inadequate transportation, and unstable income. In addition, people's subjective well-being, including their feelings of prosperity, happiness, and poverty, can also contribute to poverty in RTMs communities. At the same time, there are external factors that contribute to poverty, such as the inadequate provision of training for both soft and hard skills for individuals engaged in microenterprise; the challenges associated with obtaining credit or financial resources; limited involvement in political affairs or development initiatives; uneven distribution of scholarships; and insufficient aid for uninhabitable housing.

Suggested measures for reducing poverty include: enhancing the technical and interpersonal abilities possessed by the RTMs group; improving the availability of financial resources; offering guidance on labor rights and responsibilities; awarding scholarships for further education to household members; promoting positive mental development among the RTMs group; exploring the capabilities of the RTMs group; maximizing educational support; and providing comprehensive assistance. Furthermore, with regards to formulating policies and programs at the regency, district, sub-district, and village levels, there are several suggestions that could be taken into account. These include redefining poverty as multidimensional poverty, integrating data, coordinating and integrating programs and services, enhancing community empowerment, reinforcing policies relating to productivity and social welfare, and identifying the strengths of the community. The suggestions provided are broad and not specific, hence it is crucial to further clarify and expand them into more intricate plans for reducing poverty.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author expresses gratitude towards the Regional Development Planning Agency of Temanggung Regency, the Village Government, and the Community of the red villages in Temanggung Regency for their cooperation and support during the research process. Their help enabled the author to gather valuable data that could benefit both the Temanggung community and the wider society

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adhi, Marde Kerta, I. Ketut Ardana, and I. Made Maduriana. 2016. "Faktor-Faktor Penyebab Kemiskinan Kultural Dan Model Pengentasan Berbasis Kearifan Lokal: Studi Pada Masyarakat Miskin Di Pegunungan Kintamani, Bali." *Jurnal Kajian Bali* 6(2):229–46.
- Afandi1, Akhsyim, Dwi Wahyuni, and Jaka Sriyana. 2017. "Policies to Eliminate Poverty Rate in Indonesia." *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues* 7(1):435–41.
- Alkire, Sabina, Pedro Conceição, Cecilia Calderón, Jakob Dirksen, Maya Evans, Rolando Gonzales, Jon Hall, Admir Jahic, Usha Kanagaratnam, Maarit Kivilo, Milorad Kovacevic, Fanni Kovetsi, Corinne Mitchell, Ricardo Nogales, Anna Ortubia, Mónica Pinilla-Roncancio, Natalie Quinn, Carolina Rivera, Sophie Scharlin-Pettee, Nicolai Suppa Peer reviewers include Enrique Delamonica, Ivan Gonzalez de Alba, Gonzalo Hernandez Licon, Frances Stewart, Bishwa Tiwari, Bruce Ross-Larson, with Joe Brinley, Joe Caponio, Christopher Trott, and Elaine Wilson. 2020. *Charting Pathways out of Multidimensional Poverty: Achieving the SDGs*.
- Alkire, Sabina, and Selim Jahan. 2018. "The New Global MPI 2018: Aligning with the Sustainable Development Goals." *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)* (September):21.
- Amrozi, Shoni Rahmatullah. 2021. "Keberagamaan Orang Jawa Dalam Pandangan Clifford Geertz Dan Mark R. Woodward." *Fenomena* 20(1):61–76. doi: 10.35719/fenomena.v20i1.46.
- Arifin, Johan. 2020. "Budaya Kemiskinan Dalam Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Di Indonesia." *Sosio Informa* 6(2). doi: 10.33007/inf.v6i2.2372.
- Asrol, Asrol, and Hafsah Ahmad. 2018. "Analysis of Factors That
- 578 | *Jurnal Sosiologi Reflektif*, Vol. 17, No. 2, April 2023

- Affect Poverty in Indonesia.” *Revista Espacios* 39(45):14.
- Atkinson, Anthony B. 2019. *Measuring Poverty Around the World*. Princeton University Press.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. 2021a. *Data Dan Informasi Kemiskinan Kabupaten/Kota*.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. 2021b. *NTP (Nilai Tukar Petani) Menurut Provinsi (2018=100) 2021*.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. 2022. *Profil Kemiskinan Di Indonesia September 2021*.
- Banks, Lena Morgon, Hannah Kuper, and Sarah Polack. 2017. “Poverty and Disability in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review.” *PLoS ONE* 12(12):1–19. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0189996.
- Brady, David. 2019. “Theories of The Causes of Poverty.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 45(1):155–75.
- Davidai, Shai. 2022. “How Do People Make Sense of Wealth and Poverty?” *Current Opinion in Psychology* 43:42–47. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.06.010.
- Deonandan, Rawyat. 2019. “Defining Poverty: A Summary of Competing Models.” *Journal of Social and Political Sciences* 2(1):17–21. doi: 110.31014/aior.1991.02.01.44.
- Dotter, Caroline, and Stephan Klasen. 2017. *The Multidimensional Poverty Index: Achievements, Conceptual and Empirical Issues*.
- Drago, Carlo. 2021. “The Analysis and the Measurement of Poverty: An Interval-Based Composite Indicator Approach.” *Economies* 9(4). doi: 10.3390/economies9040145.
- Effendi, Dudy Imanuddin. 2020. “The Religion of Jawa Karya

- Clifford Geertz." *Jurnal UIN* 4(2):1–3.
- Frankenhuis, Willem E., and Daniel Nettle. 2020. "The Strengths of People in Poverty." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 29(1):16–21. doi: 10.1177/09637214198811.
- Institute for Research on Poverty University of Wisconsin-Madison. 2018. "How Is Poverty Measured?"
- McKendrick, John H., John Dickie, Fiona McHardy, Angela O'Hagan, Stephen Sinclair, and Morag C. Treanor. 2021. *Poverty in Scotland 2021*. Child Poverty Action Group.
- Morris, Michael H., Susana C. Santos, and Xaver Neumeyer. 2018. *Poverty and Entrepreneurship in Developed Economies*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Nazaruddim, Agus, Muhammad Mudjib Musta'in, and Humaidah Muafiqie. 2017. "Implementasi Program Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Di Kota Jombang." *Journal of Public Power* 1(1).
- Nugroho, Dhanie, Priadi Asmanto, Ardi Adji, and Taufik Hidayat. 2020. *Leading Indicators Of Poverty In Indonesia : Application In The Short-Term Outlook*.
- Santoso, Djonet. 2018. *Penduduk Miskin Transient: Masalah Kemiskinan Yang Terabaikan*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- United Nations. 2020. "Ending Poverty."